



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/791,992

03/03/2004

Morton G. Swimmer

CH920020050US1

4840

48233

7590

04/23/2008

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.

400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA

SUITE 300

GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

EXAMINER

FIELDS, COURTNEY D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2137

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/23/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/791,992  
Filing Date: March 03, 2004  
Appellant(s): SWIMMER ET AL.

---

John F. Vodopia  
Reg. No. 36,299  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 11 February 2008 appealing from the Office action mailed 07 September 2007.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

The amendment after final rejection filed on 19 November 2007 has been entered.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Wang.

This rejection is set forth in the prior Office action dated 07 September 2007 and repeated here for convenience.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

Claims 1-19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wang (US Patent No. 5,414,844).

Referring to the rejection of claims 1, 10, 20, and 23, Wang discloses a method, apparatus, computer program product, and system for controlling access to an object in a data processing system, comprising:

receiving an access request to access the object from a task; (See Column 5, lines 60-63)

classifying the access request into one of critical and non-critical classes in dependence on stored access control data associated with the object and the task; (See Column 5, lines 66-67, Column 6, lines 1-8)

granting the task access to the object and storing data indicative of the access in an access log if the access is classified into the non-critical class; (See Column 6, lines 8-11)

and, in the event that the access is classified into the critical class, granting or denying the task access to the object in dependence on the contents of the access log and the stored access control data (See Column 6, lines 12-23)

Referring to the rejection of claims 2 and 11, Wang discloses the claimed limitation wherein in the event that the access is classified into the non-critical class, granting or denying the task access to the object in dependence on the access control data, and storing data indicative of the grant or denial in the access log. (See Column 6, lines 37-42)

Referring to the rejection of claims 3 and 12, Wang discloses the claimed limitation wherein the non-critical class comprises a plurality of subclasses and the classifying comprises classifying the access request into one of the subclasses in dependence on the stored access control data. (See Column 4, lines 2-8)

Referring to the rejection of claims 4 and 13, Wang discloses the claimed limitation wherein the subclasses comprise a first subclass and a second subclass. (See Column 5, lines 27-35)

Referring to the rejection of claims 5 and 14, Wang discloses the claimed limitation wherein storing recovery data in the access log if the access is classified into the second subclass. (See Column 5, lines 36-56)

Referring to the rejection of claims 6 and 15, Wang discloses the claimed limitation wherein inspecting the access log to identify a bad grant decision based on the contents of the access log and the access control data; (See Column 6, lines 12-20)

and, on detection of a bad grant decision, rolling back any objects affected by the bad grant decision. (See Column 6, lines 20-23)

Referring to the rejection of claims 7 and 16, Wang discloses the claimed limitation wherein the rolling back comprises recovering data overwritten in the object. (See Column 5, lines 1-7)

Referring to the rejection of claims 8 and 17, Wang discloses the claimed limitation wherein performing the inspecting periodically. (See Column 3, lines 18-24)

Referring to the rejection of claims 9 and 18, Wang discloses the claimed limitation wherein performing the inspecting during periods in which the data processing system is otherwise idle. (See Column 5, lines 60-65)

Referring to the rejection of claim 19, Wang discloses a data processing system, comprising:

a central processor unit; (See Column 3, lines 8-12)

a memory; (See Column 3, lines 12-15)

and apparatus as recited in claim 10 connected to the central processor unit and the memory. (See Column 3, lines 35-39)

Referring to the rejection of claims 21 and 22, Wang discloses an article of manufacture and a program storage device readable by machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform method steps for controlling access to an object in a data processing system, said method steps comprising the steps of claim 1. (See Column 3, lines 16-23)

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

In general, the appellant's arguments fail to consider the full teachings of the reference in light of the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Appellant argues Wang fails to teach or suggest classifying an access request into one of critical and non-critical classes in dependence on stored access control data associated with the object and the task.

Wang discloses a method and system for controlling public access to a plurality of data objects within a data processing system. Wang discloses two classes of actions wherein one is a non-critical class and the other is a critical class.

As defined within the Appellant's specification on page 10, lines 5-8, the non-critical class grants the user permission for reading requests of a publicly available document.

As shown in Wang User A's access request is classified as a non-critical class, wherein the user is authorized to read library objects and any other library object which is publicly available within its associated ACO (Access Control Model Object) (See Column 4, lines 59-67)

As defined within the Appellant's specification on page 10, lines 9-15, the critical class grants the user permission for writing requests to a publicly available document.

As shown in Wang, User B's access request is classified as a critical class, wherein the user is authorized to write into a library object as well as any other library object which includes shared authorization only if prior checking of the access control data is performed within the ACO (Access Control Model Object) (See Column 5, lines 1-4)

Appellant argues Wang fails to teach or suggest granting task access to the object and storing data indicative of the access in an access log if the access is classified into the non-critical class.

Wang discloses a distributed data processing network for users to access a data object or document stored in another portion of the data processing network. (See Column 3, lines 59-67, Column 4, lines 1-8) If the user is classified into a non-critical class the data is stored within an access control profile associated with a group of users permitted based upon the level of authority and identifying the user (See Column 5, lines 66-68, Column 6, lines 1-11)

Appellant argues Wang fail to teach or suggest in the event that the access is classified into the critical class, granting or denying the task access to the object in dependence on the contents of the access log and the stored access control data.

Wang discloses an access request made by a listed user. If the user is a listed user and the specific public authority level is listed within the ACOMO, the request for a document is granted. (See Column 5, lines 66-68, Column 6, lines 1-11) The user must meet the requirements for determining public authority level from a critical class in order to gain access to objects or tasks within a shared authorization parameter (See Column 6, lines 12-23) Wang further discloses after determining the public authority level from the shared authorization parameter, the access request for a critical class is either denied or granted (See Column 6, lines 37-42)



Art Unit: 2132

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Courtney D. Fields/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2137  
April 21, 2008

/Gilberto Barron Jr/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2132

Conferees:

Benjamin Lanier  
/Benjamin E Lanier/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2132

/G. B./  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2132